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EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Introduction:
The purpose of this report is to advise on the results of the ‘Applying for grants from Gambling (’pokies’) Societies 2013’ Survey (the survey). This constitutes the environmental scan of the community for the ‘GMP vs. Grants in Manukau City’ project (the project).

The intent of the survey was to gauge what the gaming machine funding environment is like for community and charity organisations (organisations) in the area covered by the Manukau Ward and Manurewa Local Board (selected area).

It is envisioned that this environmental scan combined with the separate environmental scan of gambling societies, will provide the Department of Internal Affairs (the Department) with an understanding of the gaming machine funding environment in the selected area. This will better inform any initiatives that are developed.

Methodology:

Survey
The Survey was initially circulated to 1010 Organisations in the selected area. However taking into consideration emails bouncing back; and organisations or specific recipients opting out of taking the survey, the final number of organisations able to be surveyed was 951.

Details of community and charity organisations in the selected area were obtained from the Department of Internal Affairs Community Operations team and Charities Services. The survey distribution list also consisted of organisations from the ‘COGS Record of Grants 2012/13’, and a list of schools of all levels.

Organisations were asked a range of questions about their experiences with applications in the past, what areas in the community they support, reasons given for their applications being declined, any difficulties they faced during the process, what would assist them in future applications and reasons why they had not applied for gambling society grants.

The questions were based on a previous Department survey of communities.

Recipients could complete the survey online via the survey tool Survey Monkey. Paper copies were also made available at several community meetings that the Department attended within the selected area. Completed paper copies of the survey were manually entered into Survey Monkey so that the results could be included in the electronic analysis.

The survey was open from 30 July to 23 August 2013, a period of three and a half weeks.

At the conclusion of the survey, there were a total of 261 responses which amounted to a response rate of 27.5%. This included partial responses where the survey had not been fully completed.

The margin of error is 5.17%.
Objective Findings
For the purpose of this report, percentages noted in findings have been rounded to one decimal point. Therefore aggregate percentages under each objective do not always add up to 100. This is mainly due to organisations selecting more than one option for various survey questions.

Objectives that include direct quotes from organisations were selected from the responses or, where there was a large volume of responses, electronic filters were applied to sort the responses before selecting them.

Filters were utilised where an initial question was supported with a follow up question to ‘please explain’. The computer generated filter allowed an answer to be selected for the initial question and extracted this population’s answers to the follow up question.

Objective response rates are calculated by taking the total number of organisations that answer each survey question over the total number of organisations for the stream population, taking into account any applicable question logic. Response rates are noted as percentages.

The following terms are used throughout the report:

• “Survey population” – total number of organisations that participated in the survey.
• “Stream population” – total number of organisations directed to particular streams of questions.
• “Question population” – total number of organisations that answered a particular question. This is specific to each objective and duly noted.

Caveats:
It cannot be assured that the survey was sent to all organisations within the selected area. The Department’s intent with the survey in this regard was to get an indication of the funding environment therefore as many organisations as possible were identified. It was not envisioned that we would be able to successfully identify all community and charity organisations in the selected area.

Partial completions of the survey meant that some surveys contained incomplete information as organisations exited the survey before finishing it. The information captured in the completed questions was utilised in each of the relevant objectives.

Although some survey questions specified a 12 month timeframe, there was a selection of organisations that did not apply within that time. However, where applicable, the information provided was still captured and utilised as it is still indicative of the funding environment in the selected area.

The findings in this report are constructed solely on the information provided by organisations who completed the survey and are not the opinion of the Department.

Any statements that read as conclusions that the Department has made, or potential initiatives that the Department has identified, are not final and do not indicate or place any obligation on the Department to implement any such initiatives or take any possible action.
Question Logic:
As outlined in Figure 1, each recipient of the survey started with the same key question of whether or not they had ever applied to a gambling society for a grant. Depending on their answer, they were directed through to various streams of questions.

If they answered ‘YES’, they were directed to the ‘application stream’ of questions which further separated into ‘fully approved’, ‘both approved and declined’ and ‘declined’ application streams of questions. Objectives two through to seven were answered by all of the application stream population. There is further question logic within the application stream which is covered in each applicable objective.

If the recipient answered ‘NO’ to the initial question, they were directed to the ‘no application stream’ of questions.

In the event that the recipient answered ‘not sure’ they were asked to provide the Department with an email address of someone in the organisation who managed their funding applications, so that the survey could be forwarded to them.

Not all survey questions were made compulsory as this could have been seen as a deterrent to completing the survey.

*Figure 1: Survey question logic*

Has your organisation ever applied to a Gaming Society for a grant?  
(Objective 1)

- YES
  - APPLICATION STREAM QUESTIONS  
    - (Objectives 2 to 17)
  - GENERAL QUESTIONS  
    - (Objectives 2 to 7)
  - FULLY APPROVED APPLICATIONS  
    - (Objectives 8 to 13*)
  - BOTH APPROVED AND DECLINED APPLICATIONS  
    - (Objectives 8 to 17)
  - DECLINED APPLICATIONS  
    - (Objectives 10 to 17)

- NO
  - NO APPLICATION STREAM QUESTIONS  
    - (Objectives 18 to 24)
Summary:
Note: the following statements need to be read in the context of each respective objective summarised in the report, as the number of organisations that answered each survey question differs due to the question logic and organisations choosing to skip questions.

Application stream
Out of the 261 organisations that completed the survey, most had applied for gambling society grants. These organisations found out about available grants primarily via word of mouth and predominantly sought funding for social and community services. Children, family/whānau and youth were highly supported in applications for gambling society grants in the selected area.

Most organisations have applied for this type of funding in the last 12 months and have generally applied to more than one gambling society in this timeframe. Most organisations had some successful applications with the majority being granted for 50 to 99 per cent of the original request which primarily amounted to a total grant value from $1001 to $20,000. The majority of organisations consider this funding to be very important to achieving their goals.

In the last 12 months organisations have mostly found the application process neither easy nor difficult. Explanations provided indicate that the process is easy insofar as the application form is straightforward. The common difficulty experienced by organisations appears to be the time consuming nature of the process and the perceived stringent requirements for supporting documentation.

Those who had unsuccessful applications believe the process would be simpler if application forms were easier to complete and there was more information available on eligibility criteria. Explanatory comments from Organisations indicate that the following changes would also help to make the process easier:

- feedback on their application;
- transparent reasoning for declined applications;
- information being presented clearly; and
- changing the criteria for quotes.

In regards to unsuccessful applications, most organisations indicate that they have had at least one to two such applications with five or more such applications also being prevalent. Of these applications, most were for social and community services and for the value of $1001 to $20,000.

The most frequent reason provided to organisations for applications approved but not for the full amount requested or declined applications was that there were no more funds available. Despite having both approved and declined applications, these organisations indicate that the process of applying for gambling society grants is still worthwhile. Explanatory comments indicate that most of these organisations believe they would not be able to provide their services or maintain their equipment/facilities without this funding. There is also a common view that there is a lack of other funding avenues.
No application stream
Out of the 80 organisations that have not applied for gambling society grants, most indicate that this is because they are unaware of the availability of such grants. The primary medium that these organisations find out about available non-gambling society funding is via word of mouth. Children, family/whānau and youth are highly supported in these funding applications.

Although these organisations do not currently apply for gambling society grants, the majority indicate that they would in future if they were eligible for such funding.

Despite most organisations not seeking help or more information from gambling societies, those that did enquired about their eligibility for such grants. These organisations were mostly provided with a response from gambling societies; however, a fair number of organisations did not know who to contact.
Key Findings for each objective:

Note: the key findings are sorted by the relevant objective but need to be read in the context of the respective objective in the report as the number of organisations that answered each survey question differs due to the question logic and organisations choosing to skip questions.

- **Objective One**: Most organisations had applied to gambling societies for a grant while just under a third had not.

**Application Stream**

- **Objective Two**: The most common medium that organisations found out about gambling society grants was by word of mouth and the least common was via radio or television advertisements.

- **Objective Three**: Social and community services were highly represented in applications to gambling societies. Overseas aid/development was the least represented.

- **Objective Four**: Most organisations had applied for gambling society funding in the last 12 months. Several organisations had not applied in this timeframe.

- **Objective Five**: Most organisations in the last 12 months had applied to more than one gambling society for funding for different projects. Just under a third had only applied to one gambling society.

- **Objective Six**: In the last 12 months organisations found the application process for gambling societies neither easy nor difficult. Their explanations indicate that most found the application form straightforward. The common difficulty appeared to be the time consuming nature of the process - specifically, obtaining the required supporting documentation.

- **Objective Seven**: Most organisations had some successful applications in the last 12 months.

- **Objective Eight**: There was an even spread to make up the majority of organisations who received between 50 to 99 per cent of what they had requested in their grant application.

- **Objective Nine**: In the last 12 months organisations primarily received a total value of grants from $1001 to $20,000.

- **Objective Ten**: The most frequent reason provided for declined applications or applications that had not been granted for the requested amount was that there were no more funds available.

- **Objective Eleven**: Gambling society grants are very important to the majority of organisations in achieving their goals.

- **Objective Twelve**: Children, family/whānau and youth were highly supported by organisations in the selected area. The rural/isolated category was the least supported.

- **Objective Thirteen**: Organisations had mostly had one to two unsuccessful applications in the last 12 months, with five or more such applications also being prevalent.

- **Objective Fourteen**: Of the declined gambling society grants most were between $1001 to $20,000. The least amount applied for was less than $1000.
• **Objective Fifteen**: Most unsuccessful applications were for social and community services with faith based activities. Overseas aid/development was the least supported.

• **Objective Sixteen**: Organisations indicated that easier application forms and more information on the eligibility criteria would make the application process easier. Supplementary comments indicated the following would also assist: feedback on application, transparent reasoning for declining their application, information being presented clearly so that it is easy to understand and changing the criteria for quotes.

• **Objective Seventeen**: Most organisations who had some or all of their applications declined perceive the process of applying for gambling society grants as being worthwhile to their organisation. Their explanations indicate that they would not be able to provide their services or maintain equipment/facilities without gambling society funds and there seems to be a lack of other funding avenues.

**No Application Stream**

• **Objective Eighteen**: Most organisations were unaware of the availability of gambling society grants and therefore did not apply for them.

• **Objective Nineteen**: Organisations that did not apply for gambling society funding found out about funding primarily via word of mouth.

• **Objective Twenty**: Most organisations had not sought help or information from gambling societies about grants.

• **Objective Twenty-one**: When seeking help or information from gambling societies a fair number of organisations enquired about their eligibility for grants. Given that most organisations did not seek help from gambling societies in the first place, most indicated that this question was not applicable. The organisations that did seek assistance were primarily provided with a response.

• **Objective Twenty-two**: A number of organisations did not know who to contact to get assistance with gambling society grant applications. The majority of organisations indicated that this question was not applicable.

• **Objective Twenty-three**: Most organisations that do not currently apply for gambling society funding will do so in the future if they know that they are eligible for such funding.

• **Objective Twenty-four**: Children, family/whānau and youth were highly supported by organisations that do not apply for gambling society funding in the selected area. The rural/isolated category was the least supported.
Objective One: Occurrence of applications for gambling society grants

Survey Question:
Has your organisation ever applied to a gambling society for a grant?

Purpose:
The purpose of the survey question is to determine if organisations have applied for gambling society funding.

The Department also wanted an indication of the level of awareness of pokie funding in the community and whether organisations were aware and chose not to apply.

There was no timeframe or constraints placed on this question as there was a dual purpose of clearly directing the question logic onto corresponding streams of questions as indicated in Figure 1.

Figure 2: Occurrence of applications for Gambling Society grants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Number of Organisations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>176</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not sure</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Findings:
As indicated in Figure 2, 176 organisations (67.4%) of the 261 organisations (survey population) have applied for a gambling society grant. As per the question logic, these organisations were directed to complete the ‘Application’ stream of questions.

80 organisations (30.7% of the survey population) indicated that they have not applied to a gambling society for a grant and were accordingly directed to the ‘No Application’ stream of questions.

The remaining 5 organisations (1.9%) were not sure whether or not they had applied to a gambling society for a grant.

Response rate: 261 out of 261 organisations (100%).
APPLICATION STREAM
Note: Organisations who answered ‘No’ and ‘Not Sure’ to Objective One would not be prompted to answer any of the questions in this stream.

Objective Two: Visibility of available gambling society grants to organisations

Survey Question:
How did your organisation first find out about the grants available from gambling societies? Please tick all that apply.

Purpose:
By understanding what promotion medium is most and least common in the selected area, we can start to understand organisations’ access to gambling society grants. We can also compare the medium frequently used by societies to promote their available funding to see if the mediums align.

Findings:
Out of the 164 organisations that answered this question, the most common medium for organisations to find out about gambling society grants is word of mouth and the least common is advertisements on the radio or television.

Figure 3: Visibility of available Gambling Society grants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Medium</th>
<th>Number of Organisations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>From a gambling society's website</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>From a gambling society's grant notices in a newspaper</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advertisement on the radio or television about the grants available</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Referred by another organisation</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Word of mouth</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>From the gambling venue</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fundview</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internet search engine (eg. Google)</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 3 shows the distribution of responses for each medium, noting the actual number of organisations.

89 organisations (54.3% of the question population) find out about available grants through word of mouth; 67 organisations (40.9%) through Fundview; 65 organisations (39.6%) from a gambling society’s website; 48 organisations (29.3%) through Internet search engines; 41 organisations (25.0%) are referred by another organisation; 34 organisations (20.7%) through gambling society’s grant notices in newspapers; 19 organisations (11.6%) through
gambling venues; and 4 organisations (2.4%) through advertisements on the radio or television.

14 organisations (8.5% of the question population) selected the ‘Other’ category. Responses have been classified into the additional categories of previous knowledge/experience, the Department’s website and the Funding Directory – Auckland Region.

Response rate: 164 out of 176 organisations (93.2%).
Objective Three: Applications for gambling society funding classified by activity sought

Survey Question:
What type of activity have you sought gambling society funding for? Please tick all that apply.

Purpose:
The purpose of the survey question is to identify activities which are represented in, and possibly benefitting from, applications for gambling society grants.

These findings could possibly be compared to societies’ broad funding strategies in the selected area to see if they align with the needs of the community evident by highly represented activities.

Figure 4: Applications classified by activity

Findings:
Out of the 163 organisations that answered this question, and as noted in Figure 4, the clear majority of organisations indicated that they applied for gambling society funding for social and community services. 98 organisations (60.1% of the question population) applied for funding for social and community services.
The two categories of sport and other education (primary, secondary or tertiary) were the next most common sectors at 37 organisations (22.7%) each.

34 organisations (20.9%) applied for gambling society funding for health; 24 organisations (14.7%) for culture & arts; 15 organisations (9.2%) for other; 14 organisations (8.6%) for early childhood education; 5 organisations (3.1%) for research; 4 organisations (2.5%) for heritage; 3 organisations (1.8%) for environmental or animal protection; 2 organisations (1.2%) for faith based; and 1 organisation (0.6%) each for emergency services and overseas aid/development.

Supporting comments in the ‘other’ category have been classified as:

- administration type activities;
- youth based activities; and
- personal development and salary were included by one organisation apiece.

The remaining comments have been classified as the existing categories of:

- animal protection;
- social and community support; and
- health.

Response rate: 163 out of 176 organisations (92.6%).
Objective Four: Frequency of applications for gambling society grants in the last 12 months

Survey Question:
In the last 12 months how many times has your organisation applied for gambling society funding?

Purpose:
By obtaining data on the frequency of applications submitted in the last 12 months, we get an understanding of the volume of applications.

Figure 5: Frequency of applications in last 12 months

Findings:
Figure 5 indicates that out of the question population there is a close spread between the numbers of applications submitted in the last 12 months, with the majority of organisations having made at least one or more applications.

52 organisations (31.7% of the question population) applied five or more times to gambling societies, followed by one or two applications selected by 43 organisations (26.2%) and three or four applications selected by 35 Organisations (21.3%).

30 Organisations (18.3%) indicated that although they have previously applied for grants from gambling societies, they have not done so in the last 12 months.

There were a further 4 organisations (2.4%) that could not recall if they had made any applications in the last 12 months.

Response rate: 164 out of 176 organisations (93.2%).
Objective Five: Prevalence of applications to more than one gambling society for different projects in the last 12 months

Survey Question:
In the last 12 months, has your organisation applied to more than one gambling society for different projects?

Purpose:
This data will specify whether or not organisations apply to a range of different gambling societies or whether they favour one.

Figure 6: Prevalence of applications to more than one gambling society in the last 12 months

Findings:
Out of the 163 organisations that answered this question, and as indicated in Figure 6, there is a clear inclination for organisations to apply to more than one gambling society for funding for different projects in the 12 month timeframe.

Specifically, 109 organisations (66.9% of the question population) apply to more than one gambling society and 51 organisations (31.3%) do not apply to more than one gambling society.

The remaining 3 organisations (1.8%) could not recall whether or not they had applied to more than one gambling society.

Response rate: 163 out of 176 organisations (92.6%).
Objective Six: The ease with which organisations found the application process for gambling society grants in the last 12 months

Survey Question:
Thinking about the last 12 months, how easy have you found it to apply for Gambling Society Funding?

Please explain your answer.

Purpose:
The purpose of the survey question is to ascertain organisations' perceptions of whether the application process for gambling society funding was easy or difficult, in the last 12 months.

This could indicate possible barriers of grant funding back to the area if perceptions and comments indicate that process to be difficult. Likewise, if the perceptions and comments indicate the process to be easy, this could indicate that there are no notable barriers of grant funding back to the area from organisations' perspective.

Figure 7: Ease of application process

Findings:
Out of the 155 organisations that answered this question, and as illustrated in Figure 7, the majority of organisations found the application process to be neither easy nor difficult. 69 organisations (44.5% of the question population) supported this option.

A further 48 organisations (31.0%) specified that they found the application process easy, while 12 organisations (7.7%) found it very easy.

20 organisations (12.9%) indicated that they found the application process difficult and 6 organisations (3.9%) found it very difficult.

Some organisations’ explanatory comments are noted below and show that they thought the application process was easy insofar as the application forms were straightforward to
complete and the criteria and relevant information was easy to obtain, follow and understand.

The explanations also show a level of difficulty with the application process insofar as it takes time to complete the application form and obtain all the required supporting documentation.

The majority of the comments combined aspects of the process that could be interpreted as being neither or both easy and difficult.

**Easy or Very Easy:**
A total of 60 organisations indicated they found the process easy or very easy. Some of their explanations follow.

- “Straight forward application process.”
- “As a school it is easy the hold up is paperwork and sign offs.”
- “The process is not too demanding and it is fair.”
- “We have been successful in obtaining funding and I think as long as the application is completed correctly and the reason you seeking funding is within their guidelines then it is an easy process.”
- “The process is generally simple and straight forward – only differing requirements are usually around number of quotes for items to be purchased or whether it requires full formal minutes or a simple letter of resolution.”
- “Easy compared to other philanthropic trusts.”
- “Forms are simple to complete.”
- “Once I have all the information required it is easy to follow and fill in the forms.”
- “Each funding society has their criteria explained on their websites.”
- “The only issue is that some Trusts require both a signed resolution and the acceptance of minutes as being true and correct that the original resolution was approved at. This could be 3 months between signing resolution and the next meeting.”
- “Most forms are relatively easy to understand, follow basic formats, ask for basic information.”
- “Now that I understand what kind of information they require, I have a good process in place. It would help if they all had the same application process.”
- “Straightforward process even if it is not as successful as hoped.”
- “Generally the applications are quite straight forward, some organisations seem to have merged and it is always worth checking the website for any changes that have been made – new application forms, accountability requirement, eligibility etc…”
- “All you have to do is answer all the questions honestly and supply all the necessary documents i.e audited accounts, bank accounts, and generally we receive the grants unless the monthly grant allocation has been used up we re-apply the following month.”
- “Their websites and helpdesks are very informative. While the applications can be lengthy, they are all very easy to complete.”
- “The application process is relatively easy however funding is becoming tighter and trusts are more particular about the application being completed absolutely correctly.”
• “Most of the forms are straight forward and if you have the quotes and other information ready they only take about 2 hours to complete.”
• “Easy to find application forms, faqs on most gaming machine websites tell you everything you need to know.”
• “Forms are self explanatory; ensure correct quotes and all the paperwork is provided and purpose for grant clearly outlined and defined; wait for answer.”

The key theme appears to be that the application forms, criteria and other relevant information is easy to obtain, understand and complete. These organisations also appear to have an element of familiarity with the process and seek information as and when required.

Any difficulty appears to be with the internal processes of organisations, such as obtaining sign-off on documentation to provide as part of the application or meeting different criteria for quotes.

**Neither easy nor difficult:**

69 Organisations found the process neither easy nor difficult. Some of their explanations follow.

• “The applications and criteria are pretty straight forward and supporting evidence are usually available for us to supply.”
• “It is a fair process.”
• “I’m experienced with the trusts that I apply to, so am aware of their forms and requirements.”
• “Be patient, follow the instructions and answer as much as possible. Read over and read over your application.”
• “I found it quite straightforward to follow the instructions.”
• “I fill in the application form, that is neither easy nor difficult.”
• “The process has been simple but the decision making process is not clear!”
• “The forms are not complicated but the difficulty arises when funding can only be for short periods eg 3 months.”
• “Some aspects – very straightforward. The need to get numerous quotes is very time consuming and in a number of instances there are very few suppliers of specialist items. We would also like to apply for funding for other costs to help keep our offices open, but because we must always supply receipts – rather than accountability and outcome based reports we find that we don’t apply to gaming societies very often.”
• “We have not faced any particular difficulties however they do take time to prepare and submit.”
• “Some Societies are easier than others.”
• “Requires administration to compile, submit and comply with conditions.”
• “Some grant applications are straightforward and some are more difficult and require many supporting documents.”
• “Although the information requested is not difficult to supply, filling out the applications is often a time consuming process.”
• “A lot of questions and follow up for quotes and references, etc. not hard but not always sure actually what the question means sometimes, the wording can be tricky. Once you have done one it get easier.”
• “Some applications are a little bit more indepth that others and the reconciliation requirements at times are a little vague.”
• “The forms required are not complex but some of the questions are difficult to apply to certain applications and outcomes. Also the supporting documents can be time consuming to supply.”
• “The application is the easy part… fitting criteria etc is interpretation.”
• “Forms straightforward but the requirements for multiple invoicing caused problems for us.”
• “We haven’t applied as we have not had staff to spend time pursuing fund view etc to establish who we can apply to.”
• “The process is usually straight forward, sometimes there is difficulty in contacting gaming trusts. As a charity that needs money to carry out its business we want to make sure that we are asking for the right things, so calling a trust is often the best way to clarify this. Often I have had just yes or no answers to things that aren’t even necessarily questions, but a way of gauging what would be the most effective application etc.”
• “Some forms are easier to complete than others. Sometimes it is hard to get competitive quotes without paying for an actual quote which may not be recoverable cost.”
• “They have specific purpose criteria, you need to do a resolution and get a quote etc. Not difficult but a bit time consuming for such small grants i.e $2000 to $5000= cost effectiveness?”
• “Be much easier if you could apply online and up load all documents like ASB community Trust applications for example.”
• “For my sports club we are based in Otara which has the sinking lid policy. This has made it difficult to obtain grants. We have a success rate of less than 10%. Whereas in my job as a fundraiser it is easier as we could cover all of Auckland, where funds are available. The sinking lid policy has made fundraising in Otara very hard, but the problem gambling that the sinking lid policy was meant to negate has not improved.”
• “It is always time consuming preparing a funding application ensuring you have the necessary information available.”
• “Different paperwork requirements for each application. My trust only meets every 2mths so difficult to get resolutions in a timely manner. Many exclude salaries and as a service provider this is our biggest cost.”
• “Lots of work involved with getting quotes. Some companies do not like giving quotes unless you guarantee that you are going to purchase from them.”
• “Varied, some are difficult & ask 4 random things that aren’t standard, sometimes its hard to know what they fund.”

The key themes appear to mirror the other categories insofar as noting that the process is easy as you follow the instructions and complete the form.

The difficulty arises in the time consuming nature of the process and the difficulty in acquiring quotes and invoices.

The more neutral comments were an amalgamation of the above, often not noting it as either easy or difficult.
Difficult or Very Difficult: 
26 Organisations found the process difficult or very difficult, and some of their explanations follow.

- “We have applied for funding, and have been refused each time that we have.”
- “Lots of forms and paperwork takes time. Mostly you won’t fund animal services which makes us reconsider the worth of applying even though we really need the money.”
- “Education & understanding around details & process & how to apply – also applications take time & resources, if rejected many times, one gives up.”
- “There is a lot to getting the applications ready with the required numbers of quotes. It is time consuming and requires several people in the organisation to do their part.”
- “Area restrictions.”
- “The level of compliance, reporting, application, and duplication has been overwhelming.”
- “The compliancing and the rigidity in the way it is applied makes it extremely time consuming and costly to make multiple applications.”
- “Getting application forms has been a problem, the forms are too wordy and not user friendly.”
- “The process is complicated and time consuming.”
- Applications are easy but there are now only a couple of gambling societies in our area which limits the pool we can apply to. Previously there were a dozen or more.”
- “Easy to apply in terms of forms being accessible. Very difficult in the sense that there are a decreasing number of Trusts to apply to, their available funds are declining, the recession has meant more charities and non profits are competing for a decreasing pool of important revenue. With no government or MOH funding available most charities depend on this source of funding and yet its availability is declining.”
- “Finding out what is available as information is not all located in one place, knowing what each gambling society is seeking in terms of distributing funds and completion of application, knowing how much is available for distribution so then being able to tailor our request appropriately.”
- “Very tight application rules which are not uniform between organisations. There should be one central body to assess the level of an applying bodies credentials and then the funders would know that the application fitted within their rules. It takes about 8 hours to prepare one application and then 3 to 4 hours for subsequent applications to other bodies for the same project.”
- “Most Gambling society have different priorities and guidelines which need to be well assessed and understood before applying. Also the amount of funds are very limited due to the large number of organisations applying and therefore there are a lot of rejections.”

The key themes appear to be that the application process is time consuming with application forms difficult to complete and relevant information difficult to access. A common position is that the pool of funding is decreasing and, with a number of organisations applying for this
type of funding, the success of applications is adversely affected. Area restrictions, insofar as there being no gaming machines in the area, are also noted as a difficulty.

Response rate: 155 out of 176 organisations (88.1%) for the initial question and 142 out of 176 organisations (80.7%) for the request for an explanation.
Objective Seven: Degree of successful and unsuccessful applications for gambling society grants in the last 12 months

Survey Question:
In the last 12 months, have any of your organisation’s applications for gambling society grants been successful?

Purpose:
This will allow us to get a feel for the funding environment - specifically the occurrence and degree of successful and unsuccessful applications for gambling society grants in the last 12 months.

The question also directs organisations to different streams of questions, as per the question logic, depending on their response.

Figure 8: Success of applications in last 12 months

Findings:
Out of the 148 organisations that answered this question, and as illustrated in Figure 8, the majority indicated that some of their applications had been successful. 86 organisations (58.1% of the question population) supported this option. These organisations represent the both approved and declined applications stream survey population.

29 organisations (19.6%) indicated that all their applications have been successful. These Organisations represent the fully approved applications stream survey population.

21 organisations (14.2%) indicated that none of their applications have been successful; they represent the declined applications stream survey population.

8 organisations (5.4%) indicated that they do not yet know and 4 organisations (2.7%) indicated that they can’t recall. These organisations further contributed to objectives eleven and twelve.

Response rate: 148 out of 176 organisations (84.1%).
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Objective Eight: Degree to which gambling society grant applications have been approved

Survey Question:
If your application was successful, did you receive what you asked for?

Purpose:
This information will allow us to gauge the degree of applications that have been approved or approved but not for the full amount requested and to what extent this approval was granted.

Current data on societies’ websites and newspaper advertisements list applications that have been either approved or declined. It appears that grants approved for less than the requested amount are included as approved grants and not recorded differently.

Follow up questions in regards to the value of grants received and the reason for the decline or not granting the full amount requested will add further value to this objective and are captured in objectives nine and ten respectively.

Given the question logic noted in objective seven, only those that indicated that they have had successful applications were directed to this question.

Figure 9: Degree grant applications have been approved

Findings:
Out of the 111 organisations that answered this question, and as noted in Figure 9, there is a fairly even spread between those that were not granted the full amount requested but were granted from 50 to 99 per cent.

Specifically, 37 organisations (33.3% of the question population) advised that they received between 50 to 74 per cent of what they asked for, followed by 35 Organisations (31.5%) who received between 75 to 99 per cent.
25 organisations (22.5%) indicated that they did receive the full amount requested, followed by 10 organisations (9.0%) that had received between 25 to 49 per cent and 4 organisations (3.6%) that had received between 1 to 24 per cent.

Response rate: 111 out of 115 organisations (96.5%).
Objective Nine: Value of gambling society grants received by organisations in the last 12 months

Survey Question:
In the last 12 months, what is the total value of grants you have received from gambling societies?

Purpose:
The purpose of this survey question is to provide some insight into the amount of money being granted back into the community and an indication of the level of support to the community in the selected area.

Given the question logic noted in objective seven, only organisations who indicated they had successful applications were directed to this question.

Figure 10: Grants received by organisations in the last 12 months

Findings:
Out of the 112 organisations that answered this question, and as indicated in Figure 10, 56 organisations (50% of the question population) received from $1001 to $20,000 of gambling society grants in the last 12 months.

18 organisations (16.1%) received between $20,001 to $40,000, followed by 12 organisations (10.7%) who received more than $100,001; 10 organisations (8.9%) who received $40,001 to $60,000; and another 10 organisations (8.9%) who received $60,001 to $80,000.

Only 4 organisations (3.6%) received $80,001 to $100,000 and 2 Organisations (1.8%) received less than $1000.

Response rate: 112 out of 115 organisations (97.4%).
Objective Ten: Reasons provided by gambling societies for declined grant applications and the prevalence of each in the community

Survey Question:
If you did not receive what you asked for, what was the reason given by the Gambling Society? Please tick all that apply.

Purpose:
This information will provide us with the reasons organisations are provided for declined applications or applications that have been approved for less than what was requested and the prevalence of each.

By understanding this information we may get further insight into possible indicators of transparency and integrity matters from the perspective of organisations.

The question logic for the survey question in objective seven directs only those that have submitted applications in the last 12 months to this question.

Figure 11: Reasons for declined applications

Findings:
Out of the 120 organisations that answered this question, and as indicated in Figure 11, the most frequent reason provided for declined applications or applications approved for less than the amount requested was that there were no more funds available. 78 organisations (65.0% of the question population) selected this option.

28 organisations (23.3%) were not provided with any reason by societies and 23 organisations (19.2%) were advised that there were no society gaming machines operating in the area. 15 organisations (12.5%) indicated that this question was not applicable.

11 organisations (9.2%) were advised that they do not meet the criteria, followed by 3 organisations (2.5%) who had incomplete applications and a further 3 organisations (2.5%) who had already received money from the gambling society in the last 12 months.
Only 2 organisations (1.7%) were advised that they had insufficient data and 1 organisation (0.8%) that they were not the final beneficiary.

No organisations had been advised that they did not receive grants because overseas expenditure was excluded or that the application was for retrospective funding.

12 organisations (10%) indicated that they were provided with ‘other’ reasons for their application being declined or approved for less than the amount requested. Several are classified as falling under the existing reasons of:

- no more funds available;
- incomplete application;
- don’t meet the donation criteria; and
- no reason given.

There were some reasons outside of the existing categories: limited funds and approvals for part of the amount requested for two applications within the same month.

Response rate: 120 out of 136 organisations (88.2%).
**Objective Eleven: Importance placed on gambling society grants by organisations to achieve their goals**

**Survey Question:**
Thinking about your Organisation’s goals, how important are grants from Gambling Societies to achieving these goals?

**Purpose:**
The purpose of the survey question is to ascertain the importance placed on gambling society grants by organisations.

**Figure 12: Importance of grants to achieve organisation’s goals**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Importance Level</th>
<th>Number of Organisations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very Important</td>
<td>118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat Important</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neither Important nor...</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat Unimportant</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unimportant</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Findings:**
Out of the 159 organisations that answered this question, and as noted in Figure 12, 118 organisations (74.2% of the question population) view gambling society grants as being very important to achieving their goals.

29 organisations (18.2%) say that the grants are somewhat important; 11 organisations (6.9%) say that they are neither important nor unimportant; and 1 organisation (0.6%) say that they are somewhat unimportant. No organisations from the question population view grants as being unimportant to achieving their goals.

Response rate: 159 out of 176 organisations (90.3%).
Objective Twelve: Groups in the community supported by organisations

Survey Question:
Which groups in the Community does your Organisation support? Please tick all that apply.

Purpose:
The purpose of the survey question is to ascertain which groups in the community benefit from gambling society funding and which groups, if any, receive a lot of support and which do not.

Figure 13: Groups in the community supported by organisations

Findings:
Children, family/whānau and youth are highly supported by organisations in the selected area. Rural/isolated are the least supported.

Out of the 159 organisations that answered this question, and as noted in Figure 13, 113 organisations (71.1% of the question population) support children. Family/whānau are supported by 103 organisations (64.8%) and youth by 102 organisations (64.2%).

Women are supported by 76 organisations (47.8%); men by 71 organisations (44.7%); people with a disability by 63 organisations (39.6%); older people by 63 organisations (39.6%); the socially/economically disadvantaged by 59 organisations (37.1%); new migrants by 42 organisations (26.4%); the unemployed by 39 organisations (24.5%);
hapū/iwi by 29 organisations (18.2%); refugees by 25 organisations (15.7%); people for specific ethnic or national origin by 21 organisations (13.2%); gay/lesbian/bisexual/transsexual by 19 organisations (12.0%); and rural/isolated by 16 organisations (10.1%).

9 Organisations (5.7%) selected ‘other’. Explanatory comments were classified as falling under the existing groups of family/whānau, people for a specific ethnic or national origin, people with a disability and socially/economically disadvantaged.

The remaining comments were classified into the additional groups of:

- animal welfare and protection;
- alcoholism/addiction;
- religion;
- families of people with a disability; and
- all of the community.

Response rate: 159 out of 176 organisations (90.3%).
Objective Thirteen: Occurrence and prevalence of unsuccessful gambling society grant applications

Survey Question:
Have you had any unsuccessful grant applications with gambling societies in the last 12 months?

In the last 12 months how many unsuccessful applications have you had?

Purpose:
The purpose of the initial question is to ascertain the occurrence of unsuccessful gambling society grant applications. The follow up question is to determine the number of unsuccessful applications in the last 12 months.

The question logic directs organisations who answer yes to the initial objective question to continue with the follow up question and declined application stream of questions.

The survey concludes for organisations who indicate that they have not had any unsuccessful applications.

Figure 14: Occurrence of unsuccessful applications

Findings:
Out of the 161 organisations that answered this question, and as per Figure 14, 99 organisations (61.5% of the question population) have had unsuccessful gambling society grant applications in the last 12 months. 62 Organisations (38.5%) have not had any unsuccessful applications in the last 12 months.

Response rate: 161 out of 176 organisations (91.5%).
Out of the 92 organisations that answered this question, and as noted in Figure 15, 38 of those organisations (41.3% of the question population) have had one to two such applications.

29 organisations (31.5%) noted that they have had five or more unsuccessful applications; 22 organisations (23.9%) had three or four unsuccessful applications; and 3 organisations (3.3%) can’t recall.

Response rate: 92 out of 99 organisations (92.9%). These organisations make up the declined application stream population.
Objective Fourteen: Total amount of gambling society grants applied for which were unsuccessful

Survey Question:
What is the maximum total grants you have applied for from gambling societies?

Purpose:
The purpose of this survey question is to ascertain the value of gambling society grants applied for that were unsuccessful. These applications include both declined applications and applications that have been granted but not for the full amount.

Figure 16: Total gambling society grants applied for

Findings:
Out of the 93 organisations that answered this question, and as noted in Figure 16, 35 organisations (37.6% of the question population) applied for $1001 to $20,000 of unsuccessful gambling society grants.

19 organisations (20.4%) applied for more than $100,001 of unsuccessful gambling society grants; 17 organisations (18.3%) applied for $20,001 to $40,000; 10 organisations (10.8%) applied for $40,001 to $60,000; 6 organisations (6.5%) applied for $60,001 to $80,000; 4 organisations (4.3%) applied for $80,001 to $100,000; and 2 organisations (2.2%) applied for less than $1,000.

Response rate: 93 out of 99 organisations (93.9%).
Objective Fifteen: Unsuccessful gambling society grant applications classified by activity sought

**Survey Question:**
Thinking of your unsuccessful applications, what type of activity did you seek Gambling Society funding for? Please tick all that apply.

**Purpose:**
The purpose of this survey question is to identify activities which are represented in declined applications for gambling society grants.

This could provide insight into activities in the community that are not benefitting from this type of funding due to unsuccessful applications. In combination with objective three, insight into activities in the Community that are not represented at all will become evident.

**Figure 17: Unsuccessful applications classified by activity**

![Chart showing distribution of unsuccessful applications by activity]

**Findings:**
Out of the 93 organisations that answered this question, and as noted in Figure 17, most unsuccessful applications were for social and community services with faith based activities and overseas aid/development not being selected.

54 organisations (58.1% of the question population) selected social and community services; 24 organisations (25.8%) indicated that their unsuccessful applications were for other education (primary, secondary or tertiary education); 22 organisations (23.7%) each selected...
sport and health; 10 organisations (10.8%) selected other; 8 organisations (8.6%) selected culture and arts; 3 organisations (3.2%) each selected early childhood education and research; 2 organisations (2.2%) each selected heritage and emergency services; and 1 organisation (1.1%) selected environmental or animal protection.

Organisations' comments provided with the 'other' category fall under the existing category of health and the additional categories of youth, disability, services for asylum seekers and operational costs.

Response rate: 93 out of 99 organisations (93.9%)
**Objective Sixteen: Organisations’ observations on what would make it easier for them to apply for grants from gambling societies**

**Survey Question:**
What do you believe would make it easier for you to apply for grants from Gambling Societies? Please tick all that apply.

**Purpose:**
This survey question provides an opportunity for organisations who have had all or some of their applications declined to express what they believe would make the gambling society grant application process easier for them.

Organisations’ observations could potentially inform any initiatives that are developed at the conclusion of the environmental scan phase of this project.

**Figure 18: Suggestions for easier application process**

![Bar chart showing suggestions for easier application process]

**Findings:**
Out of the 82 organisations that answered this question, and as per Figure 18, there was an even spread from organisations about what they believe would make the application process easier. Easier application forms was the most supported suggestion.

30 organisations (36.6% of the question population) supported the suggestion of easier application forms. This was followed by 29 organisations (35.4%) who believe that more information on the eligibility criteria would make the application process easier and 20 organisations (24.4%) who think that better guidance on how to apply would help.

26 Organisations (31.7%) selected the ‘other’ category and included comments. Some comments about what would make the application process easier follow.

- “Feedback on how good bad otherwise your application was.”
- “Feedback on why unsuccessful, no money or low priority.”
- “Reasons why application was not accepted or fully paid.”
- “Quotes by mail should be accepted.”
• “Nil time that quotes expire.”
• “2 quotes requirement creates barriers.”
• “It would be helpful if the gambling societies spread the grants over the entire community and not just in the suburb that gaming machines are located.”
• “Knowing the value of $$ being returned into the community and where the funds were generated.”
• “Information is there, but often it is not presented in a clear manner.”
• “Somehow sped up the process. Yes/No? Instead of hangin out hoping you are going to get a positive answer and you don’t. And have wasted all that time waiting.”
• “More funds for national organisations reaching across boundaries of the gaming venues/global funding/annual/allocation/accountability.”
• “Taking gaming money away from horse racing as an authorised purpose.”
• “It would be great if all gambling societies had the same requirements.”
• “More substantial grants for the bigger charities. I wouldn’t mind if this was more paperwork, but the amount of paperwork for the small grants seem unnecessarily excessive. Also less focus on sport when there are more important – in my opinion – things that need funding due lack of government commitment/funding. Also feedback to areas of need eg. takes a lot of revenue but very little is paid back to its community of Mangere – that’s unfair and unbalanced.”

The key themes are summarised as: feedback on application; transparent reasoning for declining their application; information being presented clearly so that it is easy to understand; having the same requirements across societies; speed up the deliberation process; remove horse racing as an authorised purpose; more money for national organisations; and changing the criteria for quotes.

Some comments that appear to indicate there are no problems with the current process follow.

• “Although they all have differing systems, it is not too hard to find ones way through!”
• “I found the applications easy to do.”
• “Full allocation of grants applied for are rarely given the paperwork and processes are very easy to follow and we are aware that we part of many worthwhile causes and are happy to get even a fraction of funding.”
• “Nothing, it is very clear about how to apply.”
• “Fine as is.”
• “It is quite easy to apply but most of the time the main reason our application get declined is due to “over subscription” – meaning there were more requests than the available funds.”

Response rate: 82 out of 99 organisations (82.8%).
Objective Seventeen: Whether it is worthwhile to an organisation to apply for gambling society grants

Survey Question:
Overall, is the process of applying for a grant from a Gambling Society worthwhile for your Organisation?

Please explain your answer.

Purpose:
The purpose of this survey question is to gauge if organisations believe the process of applying for a gambling society grant is worthwhile.

Figure 19: Whether applying for gambling society grants is worthwhile

Findings:
Out of the 93 organisations that answered this question, 70 organisations (75.3% of the question population) indicated that it is worthwhile for them to apply for gambling society grants.

As noted in Figure 19 which shows the number of Organisations that selected each option, 18 organisations (19.4%) indicated that grants are somewhat important and 4 organisations (4.3%) said that it is not important. 1 Organisation (1.1%) was not sure.

The key themes from organisations’ explanations indicate that applying is worthwhile as they would not be able to provide their services and maintain facilities/equipment without gambling society grants. There also seems to be a common position that there is a lack of other funding avenues.
The key theme from organisations who indicated that applying is somewhat worthwhile is that there is a lot of effort for little reward. Those that indicated that applying is not worthwhile believe their lack of eligibility and the amount of time it takes to apply are factors.

Some of the comments are noted below.

**Yes, Worthwhile:**
- “It will help us reach our goals and sustain it.”
- “The process is definitely worthwhile when the application is successful – we could not survive without money from gambling societies.”
- “We get significant funding from gambling organisations that make possible project otherwise would not get funding. The benefits to the community are ongoing.”
- “If that money was not available to community organisations then it would make other trusts and foundations even more competitive to get funding from. It is already a challenging task getting funding, you take this out of the mix and it may become more of a challenge. Though we don’t want to rely on them and it is not sustainable to rely on contestable grant pools, they still play an important part in funding short term projects.”
- “If we didn’t receive grants we wouldn’t be able to offer our services or maintain our facility.”
- “Over time we have developed a good relationship with the gaming societies in our region. We have earned their trust by ensuring detailed accountability is returned, the funds are tagged for specific purposes and our integrity and theirs is always maintained.”
- “We are in a low socio economic area, we rely on this purely to offer our members a low membership fee, yet offer a quality sporting programme that is up to par with clubs in the more elite inner city areas.”
- “Crucial for our Trust as we do not have any corporate sponsorship and only receive partial Lottery funding.”
- “There are very few other alternatives.”

**Somewhat Worthwhile:**
- “It would be if we were successful in getting funds.”
- “Overall, given the time to complete the applications, the number of unsuccessful applications, and the small amounts we apply for, it is probably not cost effective. However, the time taken is volunteered so it is not a direct cost to us, so we keep trying.”
- “Sometimes the time and effort put into applying is wasted when we are unsuccessful.”
- “We get more money from non-gambling funding organisations.”
- “It takes a lot of time and energy for small results, so it makes sense for us to prioritise larger potential opportunities. But we still need what we can get so have to persevere. If there was better consistency advice offered by grant staff on whether or not its worth applying that would help. I have applied for a number where the staff indicated we are in line with objectives only to have a no response letter.”
- “Many hours go into preparing applications. It is very disappointing when they are not successful or when only a small amount of what is applied for is granted.”
• “It feels like a lottery, i.e. the project is not decided on its merits and sound reasoning for the decline to help us with further applications is not generally given. The bigger gaming societies are better informed but the smaller societies seem to be uninformed and lack accountability and respect for the applicants. One funder told me when they rejected my application that they hadn’t even read it through. It takes many hours of work to prepare an application for often small amounts of money, I sometimes wonder if it is worth it.”

• “If the time put into an application and then going to the BOT and then adding the minutes and sending off does have rewards than yes it is worthwhile. However, some applications are point blank turned down and all that time to do the application is wasted time…”

**Not Worthwhile:**

• “Huge amount of time spent applying and very little positive response.”

• “It is not worthwhile at this time because there are no gaming machines in our area making our organisation unqualified for funds.”

Response rate: 93 out of 99 organisations (93.9%) for the initial question. 78 out of 99 organisations (78.8%) for the request for an explanation.
NO APPLICATION STREAM

As per the question logic, only those 80 organisations that indicated that they do not apply for Gambling Society funding as noted in objective one, were directed to this stream of questions. Any reference to Organisations in this application stream, are Organisations that do not apply for Gambling Society funding.

Objective Eighteen: Rationale behind organisations not applying for gambling society grants

Survey Question:
Why has your Organisation not applied for a grant from a gambling society in the past? Please tick all that apply.

Purpose:
The purpose of this survey question is to ascertain why organisations do not apply for funding from gambling societies and if they choose not to apply or whether they are unaware of this avenue of funding or any other reasoning.

By understanding if there are any barriers to applying, initiatives could possibly look to address unfixed barriers.

Figure 20: Rationale for not applying for gambling society grants

Findings:
Out of the 69 organisations that answered this question, and as noted in Figure 20, 32 organisations (46.4% of the question population) are unaware of the availability of gambling society grants. 17 organisations (24.6%) believe that their constitution or principles prevent them from applying for funding from gambling societies.

The following reasons were equally supported by 8 organisations (11.6%) each: it is too difficult to make an application; they do not believe they meet the eligibility criteria; they do not need to seek any extra funding, and other.
Supplementary comments from organisations that selected the ‘other’ category include:

• that they were a law firm, kindergarten or church;
• that they didn’t have the time;
• they were unaware of this avenue of funding;
• the criteria and who to contact;
• they did not agree with this type of funding;
• it did not meet their philosophy;
• the applications were demanding and long; and
• the potential grants funds inadequate for their needs.

A selection of comments is noted below.

• “Our Organisation just opened last year and would love to apply for funding if we were able to get help and more information about funding please.”
• “Gambling and its problems on our people.”
• “Not sure about the criteria and the contact.”
• “[We] provide services to/for vulnerable people and do not believe receipt of proceeds from gambling is consistent with our philosophy.”
• “As a church, its not our way to raise money.”
• “Been told have used for local school who keeps getting them.”
• “Haven’t had the time.”
• “Can’t find anyone who is prepared to do the task.”
• “We found the applications demanding, long and the potential grants funds inadequate for what we need.”

Response rate: 69 out of 99 organisations (86.3%).
Objective Nineteen: Visibility of other available funding for organisations who do not apply for gambling society funding

Survey Question:
How does your organisation find out about funding/grants from non-gambling societies? Please tick all that apply.

Purpose:
The purpose of this survey question is to ascertain how organisations who do not currently apply for gambling society funding find out about available general funding.

In conjunction with the findings in objective eighteen, any visibility issues that are identified could be addressed. For instance if there are a large number of organisations that do not know about gambling society funding, by understanding where they obtain their funding information from, an initiative could be created and implemented to increase visibility and reach of available gambling society grants.

Figure 21: Visibility of other available funding for organisations who do not apply for gambling society funding

Findings:
Out of the 70 organisations that answered this question, and as noted in Figure 21, 27 organisations (38.6% of the question population) that do not apply for gambling society funding find out about other funding via word of mouth.

22 Organisations (31.4%) do not apply for funding/grants; 17 organisations (24.3%) use internet search engines; 15 organisations (21.4%) are referred by another organisation; 11 organisations (15.7%) access organisations’ websites; 6 organisations (8.57%) utilise Fundview; 6 organisations (8.57%) via advertisements on the radio or television.
Only 2 organisations (2.9%) selected the ‘other’ category and a supplementary comment indicated that current and active contacts are utilised to obtain grants.

Response rate: 70 out of 80 organisations (87.5%).
Objective Twenty: Occurrence of organisations seeking help/information from gambling societies about grants

Survey Question:
Does your Organisation seek help/information from the Gambling Society about grants?

Purpose:
The purpose of this survey question is to establish whether organisations seek information from gambling societies about grants.

In conjunction with objectives twenty-one and twenty-two, insight could be provided into why organisations choose not to apply to gambling societies and whether that is based on the information they receive or lack of information.

Figure 22: Occurrence of organisations seeking information from gambling societies

Findings:
Out of the 70 organisations that answered this question, and as noted in Figure 22, 54 organisations (77.1% of the question population) have not sought help or information from gambling societies about grants.

The remaining 16 organisations (22.9%) have sought such assistance from gambling societies.

Response rate: 70 out of 80 organisations (87.5%).
Objective Twenty-One: Help and/or information organisations sought from gambling societies and if their query was answered

Survey Question:
If you did seek help what was it for?

Was your query answered?

Purpose:
The purpose of the survey question is to ascertain if organisations did seek help, what assistance was requested and if gambling societies provided a response or not.

If the data indicates that there is a breakdown in information to organisations that is preventing them from applying for gambling society funding, then some initiatives could be developed to address this.

Figure 23: Information/help organisations sought from gambling societies

Findings:
Out of the 52 organisations that answered this question, and as noted in Figure 23, 32 organisations (61.5% of the question population) have not sought help from gambling societies. However out of those that did, 10 organisations (19.2%) enquired about their eligibility for grants. Organisations that did seek help were primarily provided with a response.

8 organisations (15.4%) sought help with the grant application and 7 organisations (13.5%) selected ‘other’.

The supplementary comments provided with the ‘other’ category indicate that the majority sought more information from gambling societies.
The majority of those organisations that did seek assistance received a response from gambling societies.

Out of the 60 organisations that answered the follow up question, and as noted in Figure 24, 41 organisations (68.3% of the question population) indicated that this question was not applicable. 13 organisations (21.7%) indicated that they did receive a response and 6 organisations (10%) indicated that they did not receive a response.

Response rate: 52 out of 80 organisations (65%) for the initial question and 60 out of 80 organisations (75%) for the second question.
Objective Twenty-Two: Rationale for organisations not seeking help and/or information from gambling societies

Survey Question:
If you did not seek help, why?

Purpose:
The purpose of this survey question is to determine if and why organisations did not seek help and/or information from gambling societies.

The options provided will assist in identifying whether it was too hard, they did not know who to contact or any other reasons. By understanding why organisations opted not to seek assistance from the gambling societies, it will provide insight into whether there is a lack of accessibility of gambling societies for assistance or whether there are possibly potential visibility issues.

Figure 25: Why organisations did not seek help

Findings:
Out of the 62 organisations that answered this question, and as noted in Figure 25, 39 organisations (62.9% of the question population) indicated that this question was not applicable.

17 Organisations (27.4%) did not know who to contact; 7 organisations (11.3%) found it too hard; and 3 organisations (4.8%) selected the ‘other’ category.

Organisations’ supplementary comments under the ‘other’ category ranged from morality to a cost versus reward rationale. Comments are noted as follows.

- “Everything goes to our Head Office.”
- “Find someone to do.”
- “Process appeared daunting, length, tedious and the rewards rather scanty.”
- “We are a Religious charity and feel gambling is a sin.”

Response rate: 62 out of 80 organisations (77.5%).
Objective Twenty-Three: Likelihood of organisations applying for gambling society grants in the future

Survey Question:
Would your organisation be likely to apply for gambling society funding in the future?

Purpose:
The purpose of this survey question is to ascertain if organisations are likely to apply for gambling society funding in the future given a number of suggested modifications/options.

Figure 26: Likelihood of organisations applying for gambling society funding in the future

Findings:
Out of the 70 organisations that answered this question, and as noted in Figure 26, 34 organisations (48.6% of the question population) that do not currently apply for gambling society funding would do so in the future if they knew that they were eligible for such funding.

22 organisations (31.4%) would not change their future grant seeking activities; 17 organisations (24.3%) indicate that they would apply for gambling society funding in the future if information about the grants was more widely promoted; 11 organisations (15.7%) would if the application process was easier; 10 organisations (14.3%) would if they were more likely to be successful and 4 Organisations (5.7%) would if other funding sources were not available.

The remaining organisation (1.4%) selected the 'other' category and specified they would apply in the future if sufficient funds were being provided.

Response rate: 70 out of 80 organisations (87.5%).
Objective Twenty-Four: Community groups supported by organisations that do not apply for gambling society grants

Survey Question:
Which groups in the community does your organisation support? Please tick all that apply.

Purpose:
To ascertain which groups in the community benefit from non-gambling society funding. Also which groups, if any, receive a lot of support and which groups do not.

Figure 27: Groups in the community supported by non-gambling society funding

Findings:
Children, family/whānau and youth are highly supported by organisations in the selected area. Rural/isolated are the least supported.

Out of the 69 organisations that answered this question, and as noted in Figure 27, 58 organisations (84.1% of the question population) support children.

55 organisations (79.7%) support family/whānau, 43 organisations (62.3%) support youth; 38 organisations (55.1%) support women; 36 organisations (52.2%) support men; 34
organisations (49.3%) support older people; 32 organisations (46.4%) support people with a disability; 29 organisations (42.0%) support the socially/economically disadvantaged; 28 organisations (40.6%) support the unemployed; 25 organisations (36.2%) support new migrants; 19 organisations (27.5%) support people for specific ethnic or national origin; 15 organisations (21.7%) support refugees; 14 organisations (20.3%) support gay/lesbian/bi-sexual/transsexual; 12 organisations (17.4%) support hapū/iwi, 8 organisations (11.6%) support ‘other’; and 4 organisations (5.8%) support rural/isolated.

The organisations who selected the ‘other’ category included supplementary comments which were further classified into the additional groups of:

- international interests;
- religion;
- health;
- hobbies (including gardening and lapidary/geology); and
- all of the community.

Response rate: 69 out of 80 organisations (86.3%).